UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,946	09/10/2003	Michael C. Matti	343355600060	3526

7590   03/18/2008

John V. Biernacki
Jones Day
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

EXAMINER
STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/658,946	MATTI, MICHAEL C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyle R. Stork	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>10 September 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19 and 22-52</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>20-21</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/24/03</u>

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This non-final office action is in response to the application filed 10 September

2003.

2.   Claims 1-52 are pending. Claims 1, 38-39, 42, and 49-52 are independent

claims.

Drawings

3.   The examiner has accepted the drawings filed 10 September 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims1-4, 24-27, 30-31, 35-37, 42-48 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Maxwell et al. (US 2003/0188262, filed 29 April 2003, hereafter

Maxwell), and further in view of Fong et al. (US 5987231, patented 16 November 1999,

hereafter Fong).

As per independent claim 1, Maxwell discloses a computer-implemented system

for use in collecting data from a user, comprising:

A client computer configurable to connect to a network to obtain over the network

form-related data from a server computer system (paragraphs 0011 and 0016)

Wherein a form is displayed based upon the form-related data in a user interface that is generated by the client computer, wherein the form is to collect data from a user (paragraphs 0014-0016, 0022, and 0046-0047)

Client side computer instructions operable on the client computer that visually modifies the form based upon the data collected from the user through the form (paragraphs 0022 and 0046-0047: Here, a user input modifies the form, as the inputted data is displayed through the form)

Wherein the client-side computer instructions are operable to provide a visual indication that a data item is complete after the user has provided information required by the data item (paragraphs 0022 and 0046-0047: Here, the user input into the form visually indicates that a data item is complete)

Maxwell fails to specifically disclose wherein computer instructions are operable to highlight a selection made by the user upon a data item. However, Fong discloses highlighting data items contained in a form (column 2, line 52- column 3, line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Fong with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a user to view a visual indicator of form elements to be completed (Fong: column 2, lines 52-column 3, line 5).

As per dependent claim 2, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell further discloses wherein the data item provides a list of options from which the user can select

(paragraph 0022: Here, drop down menus and radio buttons allow for user selection from a list of options).

As per dependent claims 3 and 4, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Fong discloses highlighting data items in a form (column 2, line 52- column 3, line 5). However, Fong fails to specifically disclose highlighting by either boldfacing or colorizing data. However, the examiner takes official notice that boldfacing and colorizing are two notoriously well known forms of highlighting. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined specific highlighting forms with Maxwell and Fong, since it would have allowed for visual emphasis to be applied to form elements.

As per dependent claim 24, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell further discloses wherein the server computer system handles a request for web page content received over the network from the client computer (paragraphs 0011 and 0016).

As per dependent claim 25, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell further discloses wherein the network is selected from the group consisting of an intranet network, Internet network, local area network, wide area network, wireless network, network accessible via modems, and a combination thereof (Figure 1; paragraphs 0009-0010).

As per dependent claim 26, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell further discloses wherein the form is a web-based form (paragraphs 0014-0016, 0022, and 0046-0047).

As per dependent claim 27, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell further discloses wherein the web-based form includes a plurality of data items, wherein each data item provides a list of options from which the user can select (paragraphs 0014-0016, 0022, and 0046-0047).

As per dependent claim 30, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell further discloses wherein the client-side computer instructions visually modify the form with respect to the data item substantially in real-time based upon user input to the data form item (0014-0016, 0022, and 0046-0047: Here, the form is modified based upon the user selection. This modification of the form to visually indicate the changes occurs in substantially real-time).

As per dependent claim 31, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell further discloses wherein the client-side computer instructions visually modify the form with respect to the data item in near-real time based upon user input to the data item (paragraphs 0014-0016, 0022, and 0046-0047).

As per dependent claim 35, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell further discloses wherein the data item is a radio button-based item (paragraph 0022).

As per dependent claim 36, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to specifically disclose wherein the data item is a check box-based data item. However, the examiner takes official notice that check box-based data items were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention as being a form based input, thereby allowing a user to select data items from a list. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a user to select data items from a list.

As per dependent claim 37, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell further discloses wherein the data item is a pull down-based data item (paragraph 0022).

As per independent claim 42, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 42 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 43, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 42, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to specifically disclose wherein the software program comprises multiple software modules, each stored separately. However, the examiner takes official notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to divide a

computer software program into a plurality of reusable modules. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have

combined the well known use of modules with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a

user to reuse modules.

As per dependent claim 44, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 42, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell further

discloses obtaining the form from a server (paragraphs 0011 and 0016).

As per dependent claim 45, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 42, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to

specifically disclose wherein the software program is provided by a third party server.

However, the examiner takes official notice that it was notoriously well known in the art

at the time of the applicant's invention that third party servers, such as proxy servers,

can be used to deliver content to a user more quickly. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined

the use of a third party server with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a user to obtain

data more quickly.

As per dependent claim 46, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 42, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to

specifically disclose wherein the program is stored on the client computer. However,

the examiner takes official notice that software programs may be stored on client

computers, thereby reducing bandwidth usage by removing the requirement of

contacting a server to send and receive program data. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined

the well known with Maxwell, thereby reducing bandwidth usage by removing the

requirement of contacting a server to send and receive program data.

As per dependent claims 47 and 48, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations

similar to those in claim 42, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails

to specifically disclose wherein the computer instructions are human-readable and

wherein the instructions include computer compiled instructions. However, the

examiner takes official notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of

the applicant's invention that high level programming languages, such as C++ and Java,

are written in a human readable form allowing for users to easily edit the program data.

Further, such human readable languages are compiled into computer readable

instructions when the program is executed. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the well known

with Maxwell, since it would have allowed for user editing and computer execution of

program data.

6.   Claims 5-6 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Maxwell and Fong, and further in view of Boe et al. (US 6236975, patented 22 May

2001, hereafter Boe).

As per dependent claim 5, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to

specifically disclose wherein the client-side computer instructions generate data

indicative of the degree of completion for the data item, wherein the degree of

completion is based upon user input with respect to the data item. Boe discloses

wherein the client-side computer instructions generate data indicative of the degree of

completion for the data item, wherein the degree of completion is based upon user input

with respect to the data item (column 22, lines 46-50). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined

Boe with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a user to visually determine the

completion degree of a form.

     As per dependent claim 6, Maxwell, Fong, and Boe disclose the limitations

similar to those in claim 5, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boe further

discloses wherein the client-side computer instructions generate a visual indicator for

indicating the degree of completion of the data form (column 22, lines 46-50). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to have combined Boe with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a user to

visually determine the completion degree of a form.

     As per dependent claim 16, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to

specifically disclose wherein the client-side computer instructions generate data

indicative of the degree of completion for the data item, wherein the degree of

completion is based upon user input with respect to the data item. Boe discloses

wherein the client-side computer instructions generate data indicative of the degree of

completion for the data item, wherein the degree of completion is based upon user input

with respect to the data item (column 22, lines 46-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boe with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a user to visually determine the completion degree of a form.

As per dependent claim 17, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to specifically disclose wherein the degree of completion is expressed as a completion percentage. However, Boe discloses wherein the degree of completion is expressed as a completion percentage (column 22, lines 46-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boe with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a user to visually determine the completion degree of a form.

7.   Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell, Fong, and Boe and further in view of Chaloux (US 2003/0065641, published 3 April 2003).

As per dependent claim 7, Maxwell, Fong, and Boe disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to specifically disclose wherein the visual indicator is a check mark indicator placed in the data item's header. However, Chaloux discloses placing a visual indicator near a data item in order to indicate completion of the item (paragraph 0104). Chaloux fails to specifically disclose wherein the visual indicator is a check mark. However, the

examiner takes official notice that a check mark was notorious well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention as being visual indicator. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known use of a check mark with Chaloux, since it would have allowed a user to receive a common visual indication of completeness. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Chaloux with Maxwell, thereby allowing a user to visually determine that an item has been completed.

As per dependent claim 8, Maxwell, Fong, Boe, and Chaloux disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 7, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Chaloux further discloses wherein the visual indicator provides a differentiation between the completed data item and data items not completed by the user (paragraph 0104). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Chaloux with Maxwell, thereby allowing a user to visually determine that an item has been completed.

As per dependent claim 9, Maxwell, Fong, Boe, and Chaloux disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 8, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell discloses removing a visual indicator if a user deselects a data item (paragraphs 0022 and 0046-0047: Here, is a user unselects an item in a menu or a radio button, the visual indication that an item has been selected is no longer displayed).

8.   Claims 10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Maxwell, Fong, and further in view of Balz (US 2005/0086587, filed 14 May 2003),

and further in view of Chaloux.

As per dependent claim 10, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to

specifically disclose adding a visual indicator to the data item after the user has

provided all required input to the parts of the multi-part data question. However,

Chaloux discloses placing a visual indicator near a data item in order to indicate

completion of the item (paragraph 0104). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Chaloux with

Maxwell, thereby allowing a user to visually determine that an item has been completed.

Further, Balz discloses a multi-part question containing dependent questions

(paragraph 0223). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the applicant's invention to have applied Balz to Maxwell, since it would have

allowed for indication of completion of all required portions of a multi-part question.

As per dependent claim 12, Maxwell, Fong, and Balz disclose the limitations

similar to in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to

specifically disclose providing a visual completion indicator after the user has provided

all required input to the dependent questions. However, Chaloux discloses placing a

visual indicator near a data item in order to indicate completion of the item (paragraph

0104). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Chaloux with Maxwell, thereby allowing a user to visually determine that an item has been completed.

As per dependent claim 13, Maxwell, Fong, Balz, and Chaloux disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 12, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell discloses removing a visual indicator if a user deselects a data item (paragraphs 0022 and 0046-0047: Here, is a user unselects an item in a menu or a radio button, the visual indication that an item has been selected is no longer displayed).

As per dependent claim 14, Maxwell, Fong, Balz, and Chaloux disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell discloses removing a visual indicator if a user deselects a data item (paragraphs 0022 and 0046-0047: Here, is a user unselects an item in a menu or a radio button, the visual indication that an item has been selected is no longer displayed).

As per dependent claim 15, Maxwell, Fong, Balz, and Chaloux disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 14, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to specifically disclose wherein the visual indicator is a check mark indicator placed in the data item's header. However, Chaloux discloses placing a visual indicator near a data item in order to indicate completion of the item (paragraph 0104). Chaloux fails to specifically disclose wherein the visual indicator is a check mark. However, the examiner takes official notice that a check mark was notorious well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention as being visual indicator. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known use of a check mark with Chaloux, since it would have allowed a user to receive a common visual indication of completeness. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Chaloux with Maxwell, thereby allowing a user to visually determine that an item has been completed.

9.   Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell, Fong, and further in view of Balz.

As per dependent claim 11, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell discloses adding a visual indicator to a question to indication completion of the question (paragraphs 0022 and 0046-0047). However, Maxwell fails to specifically disclose wherein the questions are one or more dependent questions. However, Balz discloses wherein the questions are one or more dependent questions (paragraph 0223). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have applied Balz to Maxwell, since it would have allowed for indication of completion of all required portions of a multi-part question.

10.   Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell and Fong further in view of Strong (US 6167523, patented 26 December 2000).

As per dependent claim 18, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to
those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to
specifically disclose providing a list of currently incomplete data items to the user.
However, Strong discloses providing a list of currently incomplete data items to the user
(Figure 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of
the applicant's invention to have combined Strong with Maxwell, since it would have
allowed a user to obtain a list of incomplete required data items.

As per dependent claim 19, Maxwell, Fong, and Strong disclose the limitations
similar to those in claim 18, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Strong
further discloses wherein the list is updated as the user completes a data item
contained on the form (Figure 7: Here, once an item is completed, and the user submits
the form, the completed item is removed from the list). It would have been obvious to
one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined
Strong with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a user to obtain a list of incomplete
required data items.

11.   Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Maxwell, Fong, and further in view of Shirley et al. (US 2004/0034554, published 19
February 2004, hereafter Shirley).

As per dependent claim 22, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to
those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to
specifically disclose wherein the client-side instructions prevent submission of the form

while the form is incomplete. However, Shirley discloses wherein the client-side

instructions prevent submission of the form while the form is incomplete (paragraph

0110). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Shirley with Maxwell, since it would have

allowed a user to save bandwidth by ensuring completion of a form prior to submission

of a form to the server.

As per dependent claim 23, Maxwell, Fong, and Shirley disclose the limitations

similar to those in claim 22, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shirley fails

to specifically disclose the form submit button being inactive until the form is complete.

However, Shirley prevents submission of a form while the form is incomplete (paragraph

0110). This inherently disables the form submission means, such as a button. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to have combined Shirley with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a user to

save bandwidth by ensuring completion of a form prior to submission of a form to the

server.

12.   Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Maxwell, Fong, and further in view of Le et al. (US 6934913, filed 7 December 2000,

hereafter Le).

As per dependent claim 28, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to

specifically disclose wherein multiple screen displays are required to display the web

based form through a web browser. However, Le discloses wherein multiple screen

displays are required to display the web based form through a web browser (column 5,

line 50- column 6, line 12; Figure 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Le with Maxwell,

since it would have allowed a user to avoid scrolling through items of a web form.

As per dependent claim 29, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to

specifically disclose wherein a next screen indicator is required to be activated in order

to see a succeeding page of the web-based form. However, Le discloses a next screen

indicator is required to be activated in order to see a succeeding page of the web-based

form (Figure 5, item 52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Le with Maxwell, since it would

have allowed a user to avoid scrolling through items of a web form.

13.   Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Maxwell, Fong, and further in view of Aggarwal et al. (US 2003/0126555, published 3

July 2003, hereafter Aggarwal).

As per dependent claim 32, Maxwell and Fong disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Maxwell fails to

specifically disclose wherein the client-side computer instructions perform a validation

operation based upon the user input to the data item, wherein the validation operation is

performed before data acquired through the form is sent from the client computer to a

server (paragraphs 0018-0019). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Aggarwal with Maxwell, since it would have reduced network load by performing validation at a client.

As per dependent claim 33, Maxwell, Fong, and Aggarwal disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 32, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Aggarwal discloses wherein the server is the server which sent the form-related data to the client computer (paragraphs 0018-0019). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Aggarwal with Maxwell, since it would have allowed for network load reduction by processing at a client instead of a server.

As per dependent claim 34, Maxwell, Fong, and Aggarwal disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 33, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Aggarwal fails to specifically disclose wherein the server is not the server which sent the form-related data to the client computer. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that form data may be returned to a server different from the transmission server, allowing for servers to be dedicated to separate tasks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Aggarwal with Maxwell, thereby allowing for servers to perform separate operations.

14.   Claims 38-41 and 49-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Maxwell and further in view of Fong, and further in view of Chaloux,

and further in view of Balz and further in view of Shirley.

As per independent claim 38, Maxwell discloses a computer-human interface for

use in collecting data from a user, wherein the computer-user interface operates on a

client computer that contains client-side computer instructions for providing a form

completion operation prior to sending data from the form to a remote server, said

computer-human interface comprising:

A form having multiple questions requiring input from the user (paragraphs 0022

and 0046-0047)

Wherein a first question includes a question stem for indicating a questions text

to the user (paragraphs 0022 and 0046-0047)

Wherein the data item provides a list of options from which the user can select

(paragraph 0022: Here, drop down menus and radio buttons allow for user selection

from a list of options).

Wherein the client-side computer instructions are operable to provide a visual

indication that a data item is complete after the user has provided information required

by the data item (paragraphs 0022 and 0046-0047: Here, the user input into the form

visually indicates that a data item is complete)

Maxwell fails to specifically disclose wherein computer instructions are operable

to highlight a selection made by the user upon a data item. However, Fong discloses

highlighting data items contained in a form (column 2, line 52- column 3, line 5). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to have combined Fong with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a user to

view a visual indicator of form elements to be completed (Fong: column 2, lines 52-

column 3, line 5).

Maxwell discloses adding a visual indicator to a question to indication completion

of the question (paragraphs 0022 and 0046-0047). However, Maxwell fails to

specifically disclose wherein the questions are one or more dependent questions.

However, Balz discloses wherein the questions are one or more dependent questions

(paragraph 0223). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the applicant's invention to have applied Balz to Maxwell, since it would have

allowed for indication of completion of all required portions of a multi-part question.

Maxwell fails to specifically disclose adding a visual indicator to the data item

after the user has provided all required input to the parts of the multi-part data question.

However, Chaloux discloses placing a visual indicator near a data item in order to

indicate completion of the item (paragraph 0104). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Chaloux

with Maxwell, thereby allowing a user to visually determine that an item has been

completed.

Further, Balz discloses a multi-part question containing dependent questions

(paragraph 0223). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the applicant's invention to have applied Balz to Maxwell, since it would have

allowed for indication of completion of all required portions of a multi-part question.

Maxwell fails to specifically disclose the form submit button being inactive until the form is complete. However, Shirley prevents submission of a form while the form is incomplete (paragraph 0110). This inherently disables the form submission means, such as a button. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Shirley with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a user to save bandwidth by ensuring completion of a form prior to submission of a form to the server.

As per independent claim 39, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 38. Claim 39 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 40, Shirley prevents submission of a form while the form is incomplete (paragraph 0110). This inherently disables the form submission means, such as a button. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Shirley with Maxwell, since it would have allowed a user to save bandwidth by ensuring completion of a form prior to submission of a form to the server.

As per dependent claim 41, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 39. Claim 41 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 49, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 38. Claim 49 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 50, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 38. Claim 50 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 51, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 38. Claim 51 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 52, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 38. Claim 52 is similarly rejected.

Allowable Subject Matter

15.   Claims 20-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178